D. Remarks

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph.

Claims 33, 41, and 53 have been amended to address these rejections. Claims 41 and 53 have been amended as suggested by the examiner.

Non-statutory Obvious-Type Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 33-53 based on *Walker* (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,589).

The invention of amended claim 33 includes a random access memory cell. The random access memory cell includes a pass transistor is coupled to a data storage node to provide charge transfer to and from the data storage node. The pass transistor includes a source region, a drain region, and a channel region. The channel region includes a first channel side and a second channel side opposite to the first channel side. The pass transistor further includes a first channel side control gate and a second channel side control gate. The first channel side control gate is formed in a trench.

As is well established, analysis for an obvious-type double patenting rejection should make clear (1) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims; and (2) the reasons why the invention is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim of the patent.[1] The burden to make such a showing rests on the Examiner. Further, the showing of obviousness must follow the analysis used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.[2]

The above noted requirement is repeated in the MPEP, as shown below:

> Any obviousness-type double patenting rejection should make clear:
>
> (A) The differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims - a claim in the patent compared to a claim in the application; and
>
> (B) The ***reasons why*** a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim in issue is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim in the patent.
>
> (MPEP §804(II)(B)(1), emphasis added).

The standard rejection language provided by the MPEP also indicates that some sort of rationale is required to meet the burden:

[1] See MPEP §804(II)(B)(1).

¶ 8.34 Rejection, Obviousness Type Double Patenting - No Secondary Reference(s)

Claim [1] rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim [2] of U.S. Patent No. [3]. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentable distinct from each other because [4].

Examiner Note...

...

8. In ***bracket 4, provide appropriate rationale of obviousness*** for any claims being rejected over the claims of the cited patent.

(MPEP §804(II)(B)(1), emphasis added).

The present rejection only provides a conclusion of obviousness.[3] Consequently, the necessary burden to show why the present claims are obvious in light of *Walker* cannot have been met.

For this reason alone, this ground for rejection is traversed.

In addition or alternatively, as is well known, the requirements for a prima facie case of obviousness (which a non-statutory double-patenting rejection must meet) include (1) some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine reference teachings; (2) a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all claim limitations.

While Applicant strongly believes that the above-rationale cannot have shifted the burden of proof from the Examiner to Applicant, Applicant nevertheless notes that amended claim 33 includes clear limitations that are shown in claims 1-4, 7, 10-12, 15, and 17 of *Walker*. In particular, and as but one particular example, amended claim 33 recites that the first channel side control gate is formed in a trench. Such a feature is not believed to be explicitly shown in any of claims 1-4, 7, 10-12, 15, and 17 of *Walker*.

---

[2] In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887 (Fed Cir. 1985).

[3] See the Office Action, dated 11/16/2004, Page 2, third full paragraph. The rationale only states that the claims are "drawn to substantially the same random access memory having a double-gate access transistor coupled to a storage capacitor". This is not a rationale, but rather a conclusion.

Accordingly, all the limitations of the claims are not believed to be shown or suggested, and a prima facie case of non-statutory double patenting is not believed to exist.

Claims 33, 41, and 53 have been amended not in response to the cited art, but to address typographical errors.

The present claims 33-53 are believed to be in allowable form. It is respectfully requested that the application be forwarded for allowance and issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

1/13/05

Bradley T. Sako
Attorney
Reg. No. 37,923

Bradley T. Sako
WALKER & SAKO, LLP
300 South First Street
Suite 235
San Jose, CA 95113
Tel. 1-408-289-5315